HE PROTESTANT

JAN. - FEB. - MAR., 1951 Edited by Kenneth Leslie

—a tract of the Incarnation.

BONEBRAKE SEMINARY LIBRARY

Is Britain Through?

European Protestants Say NO To War

Choose Your America!

Acheson Briefs The Preachers

ARCHIBALD and ARCHIE

Conversation In MacLeish

Vol. VIII No. 9 25 cents

THE PROTESTANT

JAN. - FEB. - MARCH 1951

EDITOR
Kenneth Leslie

ASSOCIATE EDITOR
Rev. John Tunnicliffe

EDITORIAL ADVISERS

Archbishop Adam
Ruth Nanda Anshen
Rev. William T. Baird
Rev. Russel C. Barbour
Rev. Reginald H. Bass
Rev. C. Harrison Becker
Bishop Albert Bereczky
Rev. Otto Brand
Henrietta Buckmaster
Rev. R. Alex Cameron
Rev. Boise Dent
Rev. Laszlo Dezsery
Rev. Stanley Evans
Rev. John Fekete
Rev. Joseph F. Fletcher
Rev. Erwin A. Gaede
Rev. A. Eustace Haydon
Rev. Daniel Hughes
Rev. Hewlett Johnson
Rev. Imre Kadar
Rev. J. Spencer Kennard, Jr.
Rev. Ferenc H. Kiss
John A. Lee
David Lord
Rev. Donald Lothrop
Rev. E. D. McGowan
Prof. John Macmurray
Rev. H. D. A. Major
Rev. John A. Maynard
Rev. Laszlo Michnay
Rev. Joseph G. Moore
Rev. J. Murdock Palmer
Bishop John Peter
Rev. Dryden L. Phelps
Ida Pruit
Leslie Roberts
Raymond Robins
Rev. D. R. Sharpe
Rev. Imre Somogyi
Watson Thomson
Bishop Lajos Veto
Rev. O. Walter Wagner
Rev. Wilfred Wakefield
Rev. Etienne Watts
Prof. Henry N. Wieman

THE PROTESTANT is published quarterly by New Christian Books, 327 W. 27 St., New York, N. Y. Editorial and Executive Offices of The Protestant, Cambridge Station, King's Co., N. S., Canada. By subscription only. 12 issues $3.00; 24 issues $5.00 in the United States and South America. 25 cents additional postage in Canada and foreign countries. Printed in the U. S. A. Copyright 1951, by New Christian Books.

PROTESTANT PEACE OFFENSIVE

FROM MESSAGES AND TALKS AT THE RELIGIOUS PRESS CONFERENCES AND OTHER MEETINGS AT THE NATIONAL PROTESTANT DAYS, BUDAPEST, HUNGARY, 1950.

Message to World Council of Churches

We thank God that we have come to repentance and can confess our irresponsibility and insensibility over the centuries-old decline and suppression of our people, particularly over the fate of workers and peasants. It is God's unmerited mercy that He, in the well-deserved catastrophe of the last war, still spared Hungarian Protestantism, and is willing to renew it now by His word and Holy Spirit that it may be prepared for better service.

The world is threatened by a new disaster. The danger of war is increasing. We, Hungarian Protestants, do not want to be late again and to fall into the sin of cowardice and compromise. We trust in the life-giving Word of our Lord and His grace which strengthens the weak, and we are confident that we are now able to tell in time and clearly all that we have received as God's message. We beseech you, in the name of Jesus Christ, accept in faith what our faith prompts us to say.

The unrighteous and cruel wars in Viet Nam and Korea clearly unmask those who, even at this horrible price, are bent on defending their privileges. It is with humility but at the same time the responsibility of a brother that we beseech you: turn your attention to these tinders of a new conflagration! And realize that the danger of war is not threatening from the camp of socialism, but, quite on the contrary, from the quarters of those who are oppressing the colonial peoples! It is not the Soviet Union devoted to the creative cause of peace, neither China which is still denied representation in the UNO, neither the flourishing People's Democracies, nor the German Democratic Republic, that embody the danger of war, but rather those who are again trying to put arms in the hands of the unfortunate people of Western Germany and who are stiffly opposing the peaceful settlement of the disputed matters of world politics.

Brethren in Christ! We beseech you, do everything to prevent millions of women and children from becoming the victims of a new war!

Join Stockholm Appeal!

Demand the outlawing of the barbarous atom bomb! Stamp as war criminal that government which would first resort to the atomic weapon! Fight the armament race! Join the mighty camp which has adopted the Stockholm Appeal! Fight for peace with all those — whatever conviction may be moving them — who defend the peace of mankind!

War can be prevented. But the Evangelical Churches of the world must decide as to the issue of peace and war, even at the price of undergoing tribulations and persecutions for the sake of peace. May Jesus Christ, the Lord of the Church and of the world, the Prince of Peace, our common Master, grant unto us that His earthly people, the Church, together with all men of good will shall hear, believe, obey and put into practice the Christmas Gospel: "On earth peace."

—Hungarian Protestant Pastors

World-Famous Theologian Hromadka Condemns War

I am most glad to see that the Hungarian Protestant Church Press is now launching an offensive in order to win the press of world Christianity for the cause of peace. This is an offensive of love, and the weapons employed therein are those of love.

The World Council of Churches, in its meeting at Toronto, passed certain resolutions which we must oppose. The war in Korea is being waged in the name of Christian culture, Christian civilization. That is a scandal of history and a danger of no mean proportions. I know that our Christian brethren in Korea, Viet Nam, India and Burma are waiting to see what we are going to do in this part of the world. We, Protestants of Czechoslovakia and Hungary, have a tremendous responsibility. We have the task of going into battle for the true cause in the international arena. Let us help the Churches to get rid of the burdens of the past. Let us proclaim peace until our last breath.

Our first common word must really be that of repentance. But then let us rejoice over the fact that to-day, on Reformation Day, the voice of the Czech Reformed people sounds in unison with the message of the Hungarian Protestant Churches.

To be a Protestant to-day means that one has to approve of and rejoice over the realization of socialism which does away with old injustices and helps to spread the work of love in this world. And it also involves our solidarity with those who are fighting for peace. Therefore, speaking for the Czechoslovak Protestants and the Comenius Faculty of Prague, I gladly accept the proposed message and ask God's blessings on it so that our Protestant brethren abroad may openheartedly hear and adopt it.

Joseph L. Hromadka
Dean of the Faculty of Theology, Prague
Vice-Pres., World Presbyterian Alliance

Hungarian Leader Bereczky Greets Catholics

There is a Church in Hungary. This is not a natural thing that could be simply taken for granted. There cannot be the

slightest doubt that the Church is not a thing in need of being secured and preserved. No, she is kept secure until the end of days and is maintained by Him Who founded her by His own blood. But it does not follow necessarily from this that the existence of an actual church within an earthly nation is also guaranteed. We know the names of old Churches which are covered by the dust of history. We had, at one time, plenty of reason to face a terrible prospect: our own Church might have passed away in the same manner. That wild, dark and demoniac force which is called fascism has left behind the visible signs of this danger: out of our 1200 Reformed Churches more than 400 were destroyed. And yet, even after the dark year of 1944, Hungarian Protestantism still exists.

Hungarian Protestant Christianity has a service in this land of ours. Yet we do not wish to expropriate this service. In performing it we gladly extend our hand of fellowship to our Roman Catholic brethren. And we also have such a service, in which we wish to join hands with all men of good will, whether professing faith or not.

And we have a service which we have to render to the Protestant Churches of the world. We take pains, in all humility, to avoid mistakes in discharging this service. We are witnesses who have learned something in a very hard school, — and it is our duty to pass on what we have learned to our brethren in faith in all parts of the world.

The most important part of our service today is, in this world menacingly overshadowed by the danger of a new war, *the serving of the cause of peace.*

We are convinced that those in the peace camp really mean peace, and we have no doubts that the Stockholm Appeal and the whole Peace Movement aims at peace. I have just written to leading men abroad: "We have come to know war, at our own cost, and we also know from first-hand experience what a superhuman effort is needed to rebuild a shattered country. We also know that it was the Soviet Union which made the greatest sacrifice, in the last war, both in human lives and in other expenditures. This is a simple fact, and it is for me not difficult to understand that this great country is seriously trying to prevent the world from plunging into the holocaust of a third world war."

There are situations in life in which we cannot keep our neutrality but must say clearly what we oppose and what we approve of. *We decided to say yes to the truth of socialism and to support the fight for peace.* We have the firm hope that the fight for peace will be successful. And we expect to stay — as believing men and as children of a much-tormented people — in the camp of those men of good will, both in this country and, as far as possible, also abroad, who are fighting for the peace of the world.

Our peace service obliges us to send our brotherly appeal to the Christian Churches of the world and all their members. On the foundation of our common faith, common repentance and common hope, we ask them, in the words of the apostle Paul, to "renounce the hidden things of dishonesty" and to devote themselves resolutely to the cause of justice and peace.

Bishop Albert Bereczky
Reformed Church

Bishop John Peter Says No to War

In other times, churchmen often indulged the pastime of making theoretical statements such as this: "there will always be wars," "the Church is not pacifist," or "there are necessary wars." Not now when war involves such universal suffering as one observes in Korea. Not now when man has such destructive weapons at his disposal that people are still dying from the effects of the atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima; — in these days, if one has any conception of God's responsibility for man as revealed in Jesus Christ, one cannot but say a hard, strong and resolute NO to the new war that is now being prepared.

The masses of people who, owing to their lack of orientation, ignorance and prejudices, are now misled by a false propaganda coming from abroad, will rightly reproach us some day — and I am sure that God is even now accounting us for our failure — for not having pointed out to them more emphatically what God was doing in this phase of history. If we really knew as most of us profess to know that the *bourgeous society* and capitalism was doomed by God, why did we not tell them more clearly in order to help them to break with the past and enter the new order?

The New Frontier

We live on the frontier of two fronts, not between Christianity and socialism, but between capitalism and socialism. Christianity has become entangled in the discussion of this front, because we have not been hearing the timely word of God, or, hearing but not obeying, we have placed the Church and her representatives on the side of Capitalism. We are heirs to the disobedience of our fathers. Let us repent for them and for ourselves, for it is repentance that opens up the way of deliverance. The whole world of Christendom is looking to us, who are here in the front line, for the truly Biblical answer to the questions which are posed by our particular condition.

—*Bishop John Peter*
Reformed Church

Message To Western Church Press

It is with great regret that we hear voices in some organs of the

Western Church Press warning believers against active participation in the Peace Movement on the ground that this movement favours that "godless materialism" which, in Socialist countries, "is liquidating Church and religion".

It makes us sad to see that a certain part of the Western Church Press is still uncritically printing news items released by certain press agencies which bring reports about the "persecution of religion" in Hungary, thereby providing the weekly ammunition to the preparations of a new "crusade".

Lying Propaganda

In view of that wicked propaganda which, by spreading lies about our country and our Church, has been polluting the world for years, we realize how difficult it must be for you to accept our testimony. Yet we must keep on proclaiming, with all our might, one message: namely, that God's righteous and gracious judgment is being fulfilled on His Church, inasmuch as He takes away from the Church that to which she became unfaithful and renews or even enlarges His commission when she returns to the narrow path of the Gospel.

Catholics Join Protestants In Peace Camp

In Hungary today, it is not only the Protestant denominations that have become one in nearly all issues of practical Christianity, but the manifestations of a new spirit are also noticeable in the Roman Catholic Church. In contrast to that "political union front" that is being proclaimed by the war-mongers of the West *against* the socialist countries of the East, a *spiritual* cooperation of Christians is emerging here in favor of a constructive peace, greater social justice and a greater obedience to the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

We beseech you: do not pay heed to the spirit of negation clad in theological formulas, to the voice of murderous hatred which aims at debasing the Churches as instruments of war-mongering. Rather listen to those serious Christian men, teachers and leading workers of world Christendom who do not cease visiting us and witnessing to what they see and experience here. And, above all, hear and obey the testimony of the Holy Spirit dwelling in you who is doing mighty deeds among us, and by whom, we, with you, are built unto an holy temple of the Lord for the good of your people and our people. Resist all attempts of the Evil One to turn the Christian Churches against one another and to take away our noble calling, the Gospel ministry of peace in this unpeaceful world. We who are one in Christ, let us be one with each other and with all peace-loving men in the sacrificial service of peace!

—Hungarian Protestant Press

Among the speakers at the meeting of the Hungarian Press were Alexander Fekete, Editor of the *Az Út*, who stressed that we are bound to give an account of ourselves to Jesus Christ whose entire life was spent in fighting that dark, sneaking and ambiguous piety, hyprocrisy and pietism which selfishly deserts God and men. The war which wicked and soulless people are trying to launch can be avoided. To achieve this end, the workers of the Protestant Church Press are cooperating with all men who — though motivated by different convictions — are constantly, honestly and resolutely fighting for the peace of mankind.

Dr. Stephen Finta, leader of the Presidential Department of the Reformed Conventus, explained that war is never simply an issue between two groups of peoples, one winning, one losing. This is a lie which was fed to us in the past. War is always waged at the cost of the people and of all peoples. *The way of creative peace can only be taken when those at whose cost wars are waged are given the opportunity to establish peace by evolving that pattern of life which is worthy of humanity.*

IS BRITAIN THROUGH?

By The Rev. Stanley Evans

Those who would understand the postition in which the British Lion finds himself today and how easily his tail may be twisted from at any rate one point of the compass must realize that it was a very tired lion that finished the second world war. If he did not quite mutter with Kipling "Brother I go to my lair to die" he did at least say of the "power that made his pride": "Brother it ebbs from my flank and side".

For generations Britain had lived not simply by its own toil but by the tribute of Empire. Already before the second world war the system was breaking down. Between 1923 and 1935 the percentage of the population employed in manufacturing industries fell from 51 to 47. In the decade before the war Britain had the largest unproductive class in the world. Between 1913 and 1937 its industrial output grew by only 21.9 per cent as against the U. S. A.'s 56.9 per cent.

By 1936-1938 exports were paying for only slightly more than half of imports. Banking, insurance, shipping and investments failed to pay completely for the rest and there was an annual deficit of some £36,000,000.

It was precisely these "services" that had become largely the "key" to British economy that declined during the second world war. Export trade shrunk to one third of its pre-war volume. Ship-

ping sunk by a quarter. Approximately a third of overseas investments were sold to make possible purchases from the U. S. A., before the beginning of lend-lease.

By the end of the war a debt of £3,335,000,000 had been accumulated whereas the net income from overseas investments had fallen from £185,000,000 in 1938 to £80,000,000.

What emerges from this is that during the war Britain had lost a great deal of her foreign held wealth. She had lost money. She had lost markets. She had not lost skill, and despite all bombing, during the war her productive capacity had actually increased and it is estimated that our wealth increased between 1938 and 1944 by twenty three per cent despite the very serious fact that much machinery was helplessly out of date and in need of re-equipment.

What was to be done at the end of the war? Could new markets be found? Could the nation live by work? Or would it have to live, at least in part, by borrowing? These were the issues facing the country when the General Election came in 1945.

The reader does not need to be told that the Labour Party won the election. For any understanding of the situation, therefore, it is necessary to remember the policy on which the Labour Party fought that election and which evoked a very real enthusiasm in the country. As presented in "Let us Face the Future" it was to be a policy of peace.

"Victory in War must be followed by a prosperous Peace". So the statement opened and it was on this background that it argued that in order to play its part in a genuine international organization, the country at home must be reformed, there must be jobs for all, industry must be used in the service of the nation, agriculture must be healthy, there must be houses and social services. To make all this possible there must be a considerable measure of national ownership and a full measure of national control.

In the international field it said: "we must consolidate in peace the great war-time association of the British Commonwealth with the U. S. A. and the U. S. S. R. Let it not be forgotten that in the years leading up to the last war the Tories were so scared of Russia that they missed the chance to establish a partnership which might well have prevented war".

This was the policy for which the people voted. What happened?

First came the American loan. The balance of payments position was extremely serious and we needed to be "tided over". The bulk of the loan, it was argued, would be used to re-equip industry and thereafter, Britain would be able to stand on its own feet.

Unfortunately it did not work out this way. Some of the loan

had to be used to buy food and a Britain (was this a condition of the loan?) that had voted at the General Assembly against a Soviet resolution for the controlling of the world's prices, found that American wheat prices rose so rapidly that the loan was eaten up.

Then loan followed loan and the Marshall Plan came with its clauses restricting exports to Eastern Europe and so closing the door on the only possible alternative policy.

But in the meantime other things were happening. Partly as the result of the close link with what was now Mr. Truman's America and which was an anti-Soviet America, and partly as the result of the continuation of the policies of Empire, no serious attempt was made "to consolidate the great war-time association with . . . the U. S. S. R." Instead of Mr. Bevin's promise that he could speak to Eastern Europe ("Left understands left") being fulfilled he spoke only to bark. If this needed any proof the argument at the Paris Peace Conference proves the point when the Peace Treaties were held up on the British insistence that Eastern European Governments should grant the same facilities to British insurance companies that they had done in the past.

Step by step all illusions of reform were swept away. British policy for Western German industry had been nationalisation on the grounds that it was the only alternative to restoring industry to the industrialists who had financed Hitler. The union of Britain's Germany with America's Germany on financial grounds killed this policy stone dead. And step by step the cold war led to the Atlantic pact and rearmament and so to the defeat of labour's hopes of "a prosperous peace". Butter has had to yield place to guns. Anti-Soviet politics have torpedoed all the hopes of a prosperous Britain.

This is not to say that nobody in Britain prospers. High prices are no great impediment to high incomes and present trends are producing affluence for many an industrialist and shareholder. In other words for all the nationalisation the tendencies are not very different from those they have been in the past. This leads many to ask why the Labour leaders have allowed themselves to be forced into this position, why do those who have spent many years of their lives killing the Kruger of capitalism with their mouths meekly accept all the dictates of Wall Street?

Even to try to answer this question would need an extremely long article. Certainly the answer would include a hatred of socialism as practiced by the U. S. S. R. and Eastern Europe which is almost pathological: certainly it would include the nationalistic chauvinism which refuses to part with Empire. Equally it would include a distrust of the common people and a personal assimilation into the ruling class.

It must not, however, be thought that subservience to the suicidal

policies of Wall Street is the sole reason for the present defeatist policies of Britain. Domestic trends in the same direction are strong and it was, after all, a former British Prime Minister whose speech at Fulton, Missouri, in 1946, set the anti-Soviet tone which subsequently the Governments of both Britain and the United States were to follow ever more vigorously. The Conservative Party and those it represents are as blindly anti-Soviet today as they have ever been.

Britain's Sad Predicament

There can, of course, be no doubt that present policies mean the destruction of Britain. Two years ago when American bomber bases were built here they were announced by the Prime Minister as for "training". Today Churchill can state in the House of Commons that their purpose is the dropping of atom bombs on the U. S. S. R. while Attlee remains silent. This means necessarily that if the U. S. A. is involved in war its enemy must endeavour to sink the floating aircraft from which it is being attacked. Both the U. S. S. R. and the U. S. A. with all their vast space, however terribly mauled they might be could, no doubt, survive an atomic war. But Britain with nowhere to disperse manpower and material, but the Isle of Wight and the Isle of Man! The thing is impossible as even the Conservative military critic, Lidell Hart, has now pointed out.

Rich Rats

On the surface, therefore it woud seem that the British people, as a unit, are deliberately rushing forward to suicide. Why? The most striking thing in the whole situation is that the proudest ruling class in the world, the heirs of the "Empire on which the sun never sets" (although it is now setting pretty quickly), with apparently only the exception of one Conservative M. P. who spoke up in the House of Commons, are ready to accept the destruction of their Imperial headquarters.

Headquarters, of course, can be re-erected elsewhere (although the rent might well be higher than is expected). But on present showing the British upper class, blind with class prejudice and palsied by its morbid anti-Soviet fears, has become a traitor class.

It is part of nobody's calculation, however, that the working class should move with the headquarters. Why then is their will to peace so paralysed? Some are prepared to live moderately well on making armaments, many are prepared to walk by on the other side, their economic position being rather better than it sometimes has been, while the people of Asia suffer. The vast majority want peace and are prepared to do justice but are paralysed by all the trickery of modern propaganda at a time when they so fear a resumption on a vastly more terrible scale of the bombing which formerly cost them so dear, that they cannot nerve themselves to face the possibility of its recurrence.

Yet in the distance the thunder is rolling. So powerful is the movement in the trade unions against the wage freeze that it forced a majority even at the Trade Union Congress. Strikes, not engineered by the Communists for political motives, despite all the maunderings of the Minister of Labour, but reflecting the real economic feelings of the workers, grow on every hand. The Government retaliates by summoning the men's leaders before courts. Resentment is built up while prices grow.

To check a real storm the Government is creating an illusory dust storm and the now familiar pattern of Communist scare is just beginning to get into its stride, while a country which has prided itself on generally playing the game according to the rules on the home ground is suspending the rules one by one.

Signatories to the Peace Petition in Great Britain have now passed the million and a quarter mark. This is lamentably small — smaller even than the results for Western Germany — but there *is* a growth and the authorities are at any rate sufficiently worried to do all they can to denigrate the petition and frighten people from signing it. One Diocesan Bishop signed and then publicly withdrew stating that he had been tricked into signing and so publicly repudiating himself, either his own integrity or his own intelligence. The two Archbishops have both been brought into the scale to declaim publicly against the petition. When 36 clergy replied only the Daily Worker would print their statement.

The signs of incipient struggle are here. The coming year will be that of decision. Either the struggle, although it gets more acute, will sound as a tocsin to all that is true in this tired England and the hour will be redeemed —or, led by Bishops and Labour leaders into a spiritual and moral torpor which will prove to be only the prelude to war, the atom bomb will come and those who survive its first blasts will see the truth—too late.

ARCHIBALD AND ARCHIE

A Conversation In MacLeish

It is the custom of church authoritarians to kill democracy. They may work for one or another of the political parties in a democracy, to push their controls into these parties, *or* (as they did in Germany and Italy) to sell out their own constitutional party (Centrum, Partito Populari) thus gaining the patronage of right-wing tyranny (Fascism, Nazism).

American authoritarians need political power in order to substitute their authority for democratic law. Once they capture democracy's policeman (U. S. Att'y. Gen'l. Howard McGrath come to mind) they can enforce their will against the will of the people. But to get political power they must have something to sell to the

money power which runs both parties in the U. S. Remember when Cardinal Spellman broke the grave-diggers' strike? That was to show the money power how church authoritarians could put labor in its place.

In Germany in 1933 the authoritarians had the disposal of their own Center party, and when Hitler was given the nod by the money power they ran, party and all, straight into Hitler's arms. So here they might run from the Democratic team which, dear knows, has done its best to please them, into the arms of the Republicans if the latter should take the road (threatened by Dulles in his senatorial campaign) of violent revolution which would mean a shorter cut to the authoritarian dream state: American Corporatism.

Money Buys Culture

Authoritarians use and are used by the money power on the cultural front too. Money power is dumbly authoritarian in its own right of course. It is not pure naked violence. It prefers to buy rather than to bludgeon. It can bludgeon. It can bomb and murder. But it prefers to buy. It bought the Italian elections. It bought Western Europe. It would have bought Korea. But there it met people who couldn't be bought.

Money power is stumped when it can't buy people. That's all it knows: buying and selling. It simply has no approach except to people who can be bought and wrapped up and delivered. And it is precisely such people that church authoritarians can produce.

To run the world smoothly the money power must buy experts in spreading the idea of "authority". Authority only becomes effective and persuasive as it projects itself through a world-view which tells men what's right, what's wrong, what's worthwhile, what they should fear and love, what's true and false.

The authoritarian view is translated into stories, poems, pictures, changing all the old heroes who challenged authority into well-behaved authoritarian heroes who will inspire youngsters to give their lives in devotion to this view, re-writing history, twisting it to serve this view. The money of the money power working in this way takes the place of the legions of the victorious Roman conquerors who Christianized whole captive tribes by driving them into the river of baptism.

In other words authoritarians have things to teach the masses, one of the chief of which is that the masses themselves can't do things for themselves; they have to be looked after.

"To get the whole world out of bed
To work and back to bed again,"

as England's poet laureate expresses it, is the job, not of the people who get out of bed, but of the bosses who get them out of bed. The

responsibility, the weight of the world is on these bosses. This idea becomes the leadership principle of the Nazis.

This job of rationalization, this sand-bagging of the conscience against the ever rising flood of democratic ideas, is the job of preachers, poets, editors, story writers, philosophers of history, biographers, critics, psychiatrists, and advertising men, but mostly preachers.

That is why the Advertising Council and the National Association of Manufacturers are courting the preachers today. That is why Rockefeller still pours money into the preaching business. That is why Dulles, the lawyer, has turned into Dulles the preacher. That is why cartel facism sits as the feet of the Vicar of Christ.

Power is not enough. There must be the mind to use it. There must be the heart to use it. The money barons of today, like the land barons of feudal times may on occasion exhibit the characteristics of tigers stalking their prey through the jungle, unchecked by any need to explain to their consciences their greedy and cruel behaviour. But this can never last long. For it is self-defeating.

It is self-defeating, because mutual trust is the oxygen of society. No matter how rapacious they may be, the selfishness of rulers always depends on the trust and confidence of the ruled. The trust may not be deserved but it must be nurtured. The confidence man who runs out of confidence runs out of business.

But could not the ruler be utterly cynical? Could he not wave flags before his subjects, to which he himself owes no allegiance? Could he not feed them hopes of better things which he himself does not share? Could he not talk of high resolve, of human dignity and still remain himself a shark, cold, ruthless, faithless?

While this *could be* the case, it never quite is the case except when a civilization is breaking up. At that point, when the accent of sincerity is absent from the ruler's words, even the stupidest people sense it and fail in their duty. They fail because their duty has no longer any home base. They swing wildly for they have no stance. The earth side-slips under them. That is why American super-armed soldiers today fail to stand up to poorly armed Koreans and Chinese.

In feudal times power aggrandizements were often carried out under the banner of Christ. The job of making this mean more than life itself to the masses was the job of the talkers of the realm, the preachers mostly in those days too, and the court singers.

Preachers are still important, more important than is generally realized. But preaching itself has spread out from the pulpit into the editorial rooms of newspapers and broadcasting studios, into the workrooms of novelists, poets, psychiatrists, teachers of every kind.

Archibald MacLeish has just written a little book called "Poetry and Opinion" which may be a case in point. It is a dialogue, de-

veloping skilfully MacLeish's ideas about poetry and defending a poem by Ezra Pound whose selection as a prize-winner last year was the cause of a lot of criticism, most of which appeared in the *Saturday Review of Literature.*

To develop some of MacLeish's ideas a little further we have taken the liberty of reporting another dialogue: between MacLeish, called Archibald and signified by a capital A, and a "friend of his younger days", called Archie and signified by a small a.

a: Archibald! *Archibald! !*

A: Yes? Speak up a bit, will you. I can't hear you.

a: Yes? I know. You always get quite hard of hearing when I talk to you.

A: Look! Somebody's taking us down in shorthand. Perhaps we'd better postpone this conversation.

a: No use! She's a court reporter.

A: What?

a: And this is an itinerant court. You and I and the clamour and the conscience of the world. It follows us wherever we go. Even to Harvard. Even to Kenyon College.

A: I'm a busy man, Archie, so . . .

a: All right, let's get to it. First: a question. What is our business? What are we busy at?

A: You mean what is my . . . "our" job?

a: I don't mean the job. I mean what use do we make of the job? As our spiritual ancestor John Calvin would have expressed it, what is our calling?

A: Mm . . . Well I suppose basically I am a preacher or a prophet or a poet. Perhaps all three rolled into one.

a: So what do we preach?

A: Mm?

a: The message? What is it?

A: Well, it isn't exactly the kind of message that can be rolled into a pill and neatly labelled.

a: You mean it is vague?

A: Not vague! It takes some digging to get to it.

a: So, let's dig . . . you have written a little book recently called "Poetry and Opinion". This book "dug" poetry. And I have tried to dig the book. It deals with an award given to Ezra Pound by certain Fellows of the Library of Congress for verses known as the Pisan Cantos.

A: Of course this was incidental.

a: Yes . . . *what?* Incidental to what?

A: Well, I'm sure you understood that I merely used this award and the controversy kicked up by it in order to explicate, for myself if for no one else, the deep issue of the poet's endeavour.

a: Was I perhaps with you while you wrote?

A: Oh yes, you were there all the time looking over my shoulder.

a: Funny, I don't remember being there.

A: Oh yes, when I was writing certain passages I distinctly remember you breathing down my neck.

a: Hallucination I'm afraid.

A: Well, you are certainly here now. So perhaps you'll tell me what's wrong with my book.

a: It is in the form of a dialogue.

A: Yes, between Mr. Saturday and Mr. Bollingen.

a: You are Mr. Bollingen?

A: Well, yes, mostly.

a: Bollingen is the name of a place in Switzerland. It is associated with the Nazis, being the home of Jung.

A: Supposing that to be correct what has it to do with me? The award was known as the Bollingen award. Since I defend it I use the word.

a: Still it *is* associated with Nazis.

A: How do you know? Not that it matters.

a: Jung was Hitler's psychological champion. I have a book here. It is called "German Psychotherapy" printed in Germany in 1934. It contains ten articles by Nazi psychiatrists. Nine of them appeared in one year in Jung's quarterly.

A: All this is not too interesting, and I can't see what it has to do with poetry.

a: It has to do with this particular poetry and with its award. Looking through the four issues of Jung's paper I find an article by an American Jungian Dr. Bertine Harding who has acknowledged the marvellous help of Paul Mellon.

A: Don't you think you are going a bit far afield? You are obviously trying to tie this Bollingen award to the Mellon family.

a: Exactly. For on the fly-leaf of your own little book (See, here it is!) it says that the Bollingen award is given by the Mellon Foundation.

A: So what?

a: So there is the unmistakeable aroma of private wealth making friends and influencing poets.

A: I smell nothing. Should a man be restrained from influencing people, even poets, merely because he happens to be wealthy?

a: Not restrained. But perhaps exposed, if the influence happens to be anti-democratic. Could it be that you very much *want* to smell nothing? An America which requires "a conception of capitalism in which a man can believe" (to quote your own words) must dream up such a conception of capitalism. And having dreamt it up must stoke the dream by seeing reality in the shape of the illusion. Rockefeller buys religion, Mellon culture. Ford now arrives with a bigger pot than any of the others. We shall see what he will buy. But this "America" must smell nothing.

A: Perhaps you prefer an American commissar.

a: If I preferred an American commissar I would not be pestering

you right now. It is predatory wealth, not democracy that breeds the commissars.

A: Wasn't this wealth produced in a democracy, and may it not in part at least be dedicated to the further development of the democracy which produced it?

a: Conversationally yes, it might be. Actually no, it isn't. Wealth is power over people. Wealth disposes of people, puts them in their places. To put it plainly wealth violates people. But wealth must live with itself and so its "poets" justify the ways of wealth to man. Wealth must believe in itself, in its mission. You, Archibald, have more than once felt yourself summoned to proclaim this gospel of the high responsibility of great wealth. I am here to tell you it won't do.

A: Would you mind telling me what this has to do with poetry or with why Ezra should not have received the award? Let us suppose it was not Bollingen's but someone's of whom you approve?

a: Very well. It was a good thing you wrote that little book. First it brought me here and second, it showed one thing. You were yourself not quite sold on that award. You wanted to sell yourself. You almost did.

A: Almost?

a: But not quite. You appeared to feel duty bound for some unrevealed reason to defend that Mellon award. In your dialogue you put into the mouth of your opponent Mr. Saturday very few arguments. You kept him at a pretty low level, if I may say so. You did a lot of quoting. To prove that poetry is this and isn't that. You worked your way back from Ortega y Gasset through Milton and Horace to Aristotle. Aristotle had the right answer.

A: For both of us, Mr. Bollingen and Mr. Saturday.

a: Yes, for both of you. But your use of Aristotle is a misuse.

A: How?

a: In having Aristotle support fascism. It might have been plausible to use Plato in this way. But certainly not Aristotle.

A: You are jabbing me with conclusions. I am doing my best to be patient. Kindly tell me in precisely what way I misuse Aristotle.

a: You don't mind if I quote you?

A: Why should I mind?

a: Because it may be disquieting. First: the Aristotelian definition of poetry (page 41). "An instrument of knowledge" which reveals "the underlying coherence" which life has in the poet's time. Is this it?

A: Of course. It is what I said.

a: And you had already on page 8 told Mr. Saturday that politics is not or should not be involved in judging or appraising poetry. Mr. Saturday had quoted Pound's anti-Semitic and pro-fascist lines, and you jumped him. "Ah," you said, "so that's the issue about which a man ought to feel violently? It's a question of

politics." Let me ask you a question. Has politics anything to do with economics? Or with other social institutions?

A: Politics is politics. And economics is economics. Politics deals with the legal frame of society, the basic law and the superimposed legal edifice within whose limits our various social institutions, arts, sciences, businesses, operate.

a: You left out that social institution known as the church. But perhaps that was an inadvertant omission.

A: I didn't notice. Probably I left out other things too.

a: But the church once, not so very long ago, dominated politics. So that an institution within this political framework through its power over the minds of men as well as through its hold on economic life was able to dominate that framework.

A: Nevertheless it did remain separate and distinct.

a: In legal fiction, yes. In effect, no. And the same thing happens today, only the institution that dominates politics, that *is* politics today in our Western world is business, economics, the theory and practice of non-competitive capitalism.

Just as the non-competitive church once brought its influence to bear, preferably by gentle persuasion but if necessary by rack and fire, so today non-competing capitalists use similar means to maintain a world of poverty, ignorance and war. Not that they like to see people poor, ignorant and victimized by war, but they can't imagine any alternative that would not mean their own sure destruction.

Queen Wilhelmina did not necessarily enjoy thinking of millions dying because of her restriction of the production of quinine in her Dutch East Indies, restriction which meant profits for her and death to her brothers and sisters all over the world. Yet she did carefully and scientifically restrict it. It was economics. And this economics became the politics of Holland. Just as the Oriental Consolidated Mining Company and the Oriental Development Company became politics today in Korea.

A: Bravo, Comrade! I thought you had shed that sort of oversimplification. Now once more, would it be rude to ask: what in the name of Dante this has to do with poetry?

a: Just as the church tried to harness the arts in its service so business today tries to harness the universities, the churches and the arts (including poetry) in its service. Does that answer you?

A: It would if it were true.

a: Sometimes, Archibald, a clever man can insulate himself against the disturbing personal context of what in other contexts he furiously upholds as the truth.

In the person of Mr. Bollingen (page 44) you burst out passionately against the rottenness of our society: "a vast disorder; a confused, bewildered materialistic civilization run-

ning blindly and without dignity or faith upon vulgarity and death; a generation lost to its past and its future, to beauty and to grace." This is the truth about our day and age which, you say, Pound reveals. And your eloquence betrays the fact that it is you who speak here through Bollingen.

A: Well, is not what I said the truth.

a: Yes, it is, Archibald. But can you see that you are a part of this vulgarity when you lend your fine talent to the defence of Mellon and Jung and Pound?

Pound is a fascist, a worshipper of the crucified Mussolini. You say "No one would trust the insights of a Communist poet or a Franco-fascist. With them the opinions come first and the poetry—if you can call it that — comes after." Now what is the difference between a Franco-fascist and a Mussolini-fascist, which is what Pound was.

But then you go on to say tut-tut, Pound was "infantile", "distorted". You turn his fascism into a kind of juvenile delinquency. Kid stuff. "The question," you say, "is not one of the childishness and perversity of Pound's political beliefs as they are expressed in this poem."

A: I will admit that it is wrong to make light of fascist opinions, and I did not really intend to do that, but my point was that these opinions were extraneous to deep insights into the sickness of our age which were the heart of the poem.

a: But fascism is not an opinion, or opinions. It is a faith, an evil monstrous faith, an ancient cruel faith. And its words are flags of that faith. There is nothing casual or incidental about them. Nor will you brush them off as mere infantilism if you are alive to their significance.

A: Alright, let me ask you a question. Does not Pound at least reveal the vulgarity of the age he lives in, even if in his loyalty to fascism he shares that vulgarity? As a matter of fact, come to think of it, it is of the essence of vulgarity to make a display of learning and to delight in pompous obscurity. It is indeed a part of our sickness. It is atomistic. It is the penalty of anarch individualism. But I still insist that Pound's fascism is extraneous to his poem.

a: Let me quote Mr. Bollingen, "It is only with its evil about it that this poem can give this poet's vision of his hell. For he himself is damned in it and speaks." Do you not fall here into the sentimentality of the spectator?

You see Mussolini hanging head down in the market place and you pity him. You see the poor demented wreck of the incarcerated Pound and, because you are a spectator and never suffered in your flesh the consequences of his poison faith, you are able to shrug off this faith as an evil that is "about" his poem. But the evil is *in* his poem. It is part and parcel of it.

A: Do you agree at least that in Pound's poem "the loyalty is not to dogmas of fascism but to the poet's vision of a tragic disorder

which lies far deeper in our lives and in our time?"

a: The question is: does he speak of disorder as a partisan of order? I think he does not. You cannot paint a black line on a black canvas. The revelation of darkness must be made against a background of light.

You said most eloquently that "even from the elevation of a dunghill it is possible to see the figure of the man against the stars..." But the stars must be there to see him against. Pound's answer to the dunghill is another bigger dunghill. He lacks a place to stand from which to view and measure the misery of the world.

Pound is where you put him, in hell. Poets can go to hell, but only after they have ceased being poets. There are no poets in hell. That is why it is hell.

A: I still think that Pound's ultimate and essential loyalty is to his art and that his fascism—and I agree that to call it childishness is perhaps to make too light of it—his fascism is an excrescence, unfortunate, even tragic, but not the essence of his poem. The essential character of this poem is to reflect for us the low estate into which our age has fallen.

a: And I ask you how there can be reflection without light, and is there light in this poem, or around or behind this poem?

Have you ever thought that perhaps the degeneracy of this age is one of the reasons for its recognition of Pound in the first place? Perhaps you remember "Paris Was Our Mistress" where Samuel Putnam tells of the night "when we were all at a house somewhere down in the country. Cowley (Malcolm) and Josephson and Cummings (e. e.), I remember were there. Our host had an elaborately bound set of the works of Racine, and by way of showing our contempt for this kind of 'literature', we took the volumes and tossed them into the fireplace. Then, as they went up in smoke, we all stood around and urinated upon the embers." Is it entirely an accident, Archibald, that two of these ambassadors of culture, Cowley and Cummings, have showed up among the protestors against the Saturday Review of Literature (Mr. Saturday) anti-Pound articles?

A: I really cannot see the point of bringing up this disagreeable episode.

a: My point is that these poets do not stand apart from their age and reflect it in the light of the ages,*sub specie aeternitatis.* And I am searching for the reason for that. If you are still teachable, Archibald, we might learn together what the reason is. Or shall we leave this conversation to another day?

A: No. Let us get it over with now. I cannot promise to agree with you. But I do promise to chew over what you say. I shall be honestly interested to know what you think is the reason for the futility of most of our poets.

a: On page 10 of your little book you and Mr. Saturday both agree that poetry is not an end in itself. And yet on page 51

you base your whole support of the Pound award on the fact that Pound "is loyal in the end not to his opinions but to his art."

Through most of the book you develop a theory of the function of poetry, using Mr. Saturday to voice opinions you discard along the way. You do it cleverly. You cite Rimbaud and Shelley and Blake as rebels.

But I think you know that these poets were rebels against the very things Pound glorifies. You speak of Rimbaud's calling Christ "eternal thief of the energies" as a blasphemy. But many of the sayings of the mystics (Blake himself for instance) appeared blasphemous. Christ went to the cross for blasphemy.

The "Christ" of whom Rimbaud spoke might have called forth a similar comment from Jesus of Nazareth. There is a continuity of reference, a oneness of revelation down through the works of the true poets despite their bewildering variety.

Now while you were whittling away at poor Mr. Saturday until he gave away one position after another you were also whittling away at yourself.

You made him agree that poetry is not teaching. And of course it is true that poetry is not an explanatory process. But when teaching is at its best, when teaching is infection, the poet is the teacher par excellence. It might even be said that the true teacher must be a poet. Shaw's saying "If you can't do, teach!" is merely a commentary on the low estate of education.

The poet is by definition the doer. And it is supremely from the doer that the pupil catches the knack of doing. It is this knack of doing which is the centre and soul of life, of integrity, of salvation.

It is the job of the poet to lure, to lead, to betray men into that place in their lives where they must get the knack of living or die. They must sink or swim.

If Pound has done that for you, Archibald, then he has made a poem. The award, I think we will both agree, does not greatly matter.

: What mattered to me in this dialogue was the question: what is poetry?

: Quite. Now your Mr. Saturday took the position (which of course you gave him only to take it away) that poetry "must stand or fall by the merits of what it says" because "it has consequences." You demolish him by saying "This is not the standard one would apply to a Minoan figure or a Chinese urn or the west window of Chartres." But in judging these objects should we not consider what they were made for. The makers did not think of us when they made them. They did not think of spectators. They thought of users. Of participants. Of practical purposes. And these practical pur-

poses they enriched, deepened, illuminated by the shape and colour of these implements. For that is what they were, implements. And it is certainly appropriate to say that an implement "has consequences."

A: But surely you would not call the Chartres window a mere thing of utility?

a: But yes, of course. An instrument of worship in a time when men were closer to the meaning of worship than they are today. To work is to pray, the old monks said. Are Pound and Eliot (shall I include MacLeish?) prostrated by life (I don't mean the *thought* of life)? Do they therefore understand the nature of prayer? Or are they spectators, removed from life by that white line down there just beyond the bleachers?

You say that "external standards of political or religious or economic or patriotic virtue" would lead to the subversion of poetry to pressure groups of one sort or another. And you add that "poetry might easily be subverted in the United States if authoritarianism is permitted to extend its growing influence here."

A: I know what you are getting at. No need to rub it in. This very award, you would say, is the expression of such a pressure group, emanating in some sinister and unexplained manner from a modern Croesus. You would say that the point of subversion has already been reached in the United States. If you believe that a single one of the Fellows participating in this award was ever for a single instant under pressure of any kind to give this award to Pound then you are . . . well, let us say that someone has imposed on you.

a: Let me repeat this thing as plainly as I can. In the beginning was the Word not the words. The Word became flesh and the flesh was full of grace and reality. But that flesh revealed its grace and reality through deeds that restored men's integrity and through stories that threw light on how man had lost and regained his integrity. These poems were hard, effectual. They cut ice. They mattered. They had consequences.

This poet was called Teacher. But the world found it hard to recognize the poet as teacher or the teacher as poet. For the world was busy conniving and contriving. And the world still is busy that way. Except in that half of the world where men and women are being coaxed and lured and pulled out of their conniving and contriving back to their lost integrity.

A: What is that integrity?

a: It is simply an honest wholehearted approach to their work. A mechanic might call it a meshing of gears with the cosmic process. A monk would call it the worship that is work. An Athenian citizen would have called it liturgy or public service,

a phrase which has become chilled in its capitalist context.

A: This integrity you speak of. Surely you would not intimate that it can be forced!

a: It cannot be forced. It is natural to men. "My yoke is easy and my burden is light." But the frame, the political-economic frame in which it can be "easy" and "light" — that frame must have the power to resist those whose interest it is to keep upon men's necks a yoke that is uneasy and heavy, to keep men bound to the wheel of profit that exploits and prostitutes them.

This power must be strong in proportion to the pressure of resistance. Just as a mother must push against the resistance of her body to bring her child to birth.

Rich men resist this integrity, as that poet Teacher of Nazareth well knew. It is or should be the business of politics to protect this integrity. When politics does protect it then politics becomes poetry. And the statesmen who build a state that protects it are poets. That is why politics today is not mere opinion and cannot be extraneous to any expression of the deep significance of our age.

A great priest has said political economy today is religion because it meets man at the point of his greatest need. So can we say politics is poetry for it is in politics that the deepest aspirations of man are being expressed. The American Bill of Rights was poetry and it was also an eighteenth century addition to the Book of Acts.

Rich men are subverting it. And these rich men use the fiddle faddle that goes by the name of politics today in the U. S. A. and Canada for the sake of fooling the people who are now so completely fooled that they would feel hurt to be unfooled. Both the fiddle party and the faddle party belong to the rich and there is not a hair to choose between them.

On this continent you have one party, one politics, a monolith of terror, of despair, of frustration, of hysteria. Such a mess that you many wonder, Archibald, why I bother to come back to you after my holiday.

A: Yes, I was beginning to wonder.

a: Well, I came because I really think you are interested in poetry and want to be honest about it. You may have gotten off the beam. You can get back on. But not with rich men. You must cut clean from them. "What creates an age," you say, "is a new sensibility; a new figure in a new landscape." That is true. But you go on to say that this means "a new expectation with regard to poetry. For poetry is the human gesture which is most certain to change as sensibility changes." And here again you make of the poet a derivative figure. It is the poet who creates the new age. Poetry is more than gesture. It is impregnation and it is gestation.

ACHESON BRIEFS THE PREACHERS

The National Council of Churches, newly formed organ of non-Roman ecumenical ecclesiasticism, has begun its work by praying for one side of the conflict in Korea and listening to that side present its case before its opening conference.

Mr. Acheson who presented that side assured the conference that there would be a "great increase in the power and the effectiveness of the Christian communions which are now uniting to form the National Council." In this assurance he spoke as a politician. Jesus of Nazareth has had a certain influence in the affairs of the world. But this influence is rarely commensurate with the growth in numbers and in prestige of organizations calling themselves by his name. Just getting together means nothing in itself. Sheep get together. And so do wolves.

Mr. Acheson and his colleagues are in a serious situation involving all people everywhere on this earth. Yet at this perilous moment when humility and honesty were required Mr. Acheson told over again his distorted version of American intervention in the Far East. He said that the UN in Korea is "putting down by force of arms a crime committed against the international community," and that "across vast seas and from distant lands, men of many nations came together under the flag of the United Nations to push back the invaders." He did not go so far as to say that it is the United Nations that is attacking China through the U. S. blockade of Formosa, although this act was part and parcel of the intervention in Korea. He didn't say that Truman went to Wake Island to instruct or be instructed by MacArthur as a representative of the United Nations. Nor did he try to explain why the United Nations ran up the United States flag in Seoul when they conquered that city. He said that the United Nations forces "made their way up the peninsula, driving the aggressors before them." But he did not mention the air-strafing of civilians, the wholesale destruction of villages and towns, the "carpet" bombing of cities. Nor did he talk about the United Nations' continued sponsorship of the unspeakable Rhee even after his own South Korean parliament had condemned him.

True, it would have been impossible for Acheson in one speech to have covered all the events of the past four months. But he told a lot by what he left out.

For instance, he made much of how the UN and the U. S. had made it unmistakeably clear that "the sole mission of the United Nations forces was to repel the aggressors and to restore to the people of Korea their independence." But he did not explain how this "sole mission" was connected with the mission of the U. S. fleet in Formosan waters. It would have been hard indeed to explain

how the U. S. could intervene in behalf of the UN in Korea and at the same time continue its long-standing intervention in the Chinese Civil war by blockading Formosa. Evidently Formosa is China's if Chiang keeps it, but not if Mao gets it, just as Korea is one and indivisible if Rhee gets it but not if Kim gets it. That's the Truman Doctrine as practised by Acheson, who takes valuable time off to wrinkle the poor ministers' brows with the weight of world affairs.

When the UN armies crossed the "vast seas from distant lands" and entered Korea Acheson and his colleagues stated that the purpose was simply to push the North Koreans back across their border, the 38th parallel, but as everybody who reads the newspapers is well aware, they didn't stop there. It was on the basis of that declaration that many gullible American and Canadian liberals went along with the intervention. But now that declaration is exposed as part of the hoax of a "police action" which was, as The Protestant said at the beginning of this war, a plain act of aggression by the US - UN in a civil war.

There is a tendency to make MacArthur the goat for Acheson and Company. But MacArthur is just a loyal member of the team, no doubt with bloodthirsty idiosyncrasies of his own, but serving the same policy. Mr. Acheson's self-shriving talk to the dominies will not relieve him of full responsibility for the foul murder of a small brave people.

CHOOSE YOUR AMERICA

On Sept. 1, 1950, Ted Thackrey, answering a letter to the Editor, said in his *Daily Compass*, "I believe armed intervention by US - UN forces (in Korea) was essential to support the law outlawing military invasion of one political unit from another."

As far as we know Mr. Thackrey has not changed this belief which he shared with many other liberals, among them Corliss Lamont, I. F. Stone, Jennings Perry, Henry Wallace, John Rogge.

The strange thing about this is that every issue of Mr. Thackrey's paper contains enough "stuff" to blow his "belief" to pieces.

There is little logic or consistency in the belief. There are few if any facts under it. It was apparently taken up rather hurriedly and stuck to stubbornly in the face of a rising pile of evidence against it.

If North Korea broke the "law" and needed to be punished by US - UN forces, then China has compounded the fracture by deliberately attacking the US - UN "policeman" and therefore needs punishment too.

Yet Mr. Thackrey does not want China punished. He says

now that *peace must come first.* If peace must come first now, why didn't peace come first on May 27th?

Would it be cynical to suggest that whereas there never could be any real doubt that the US - UN forces would be able ultimately to whip that very small nation, Korea, there is a real question as to the ability of the US - UN forces to whip China? And that the size of the new culprit has softened Mr. Thackrey's and his friends' moral judgment?

The position of these liberals is difficult. They could *see* Nazism in Germany. It was across a big ocean. They could see even American Fascism when it was in the future.

In the perspective of space or time it was visible to these good people. But now that it has hit them over the head they suddenly see only stars - - and stripes! They simply cannot bring themselves to believe the truth they have tried so hard to prepare themselves for.

They cannot bring themselves to realize that all those evils they inveighed against so long have finally accumulated and coalesced and taken possession of their country.

They know there is evil and corruption at every level of their government, but they cannot bear to think that the government itself could have become corrupted. Their blood and bones cry out against the shame of what has gone on in Korea, at first through Rhee under US sponsorship and then through MacArthur. Yet the same blood and bones forbid them to look upon this shame. For to look upon it would be to see the dream of Lincoln undone, betrayed. It would mean a too terrible choice.

Morford, Fast, Lawson, Bryan, Fleischman and the others went to jail for their choice. Fast had written of the America of Lincoln's dream. He had chosen that America which meant that he must repudiate MacArthur's America. It is plain there is no room on this earth for them both.

NOTE ON ABSENTEES

We call your attention to the fact that some names, long on the masthead of The Protestant, are absent. It should not, however, be hastily concluded that the missing ones are necessarily lost to us foreveer. In many cases it is just that their association with The Protestant interfered with other tasks.

The Protestant is in an exposed position in the struggle for peace. Many of those associated with us are fighting on other no less important sectors. They believe their effectiveness in their particular sector would be hampered by further association with The Protestant.

We do not say this to urge others to take the same course. On

the contrary we urge all those who can possibly do so to close ranks with us so that we may present a strong protest against those who have brought slaughter and devastation to Korea, and who will, if not restrained, spread the flames of war until they engulf the entire world.

ECUMENICAL CASUISTRY

A special "atomic weapons" commission, of the Federal Council of Churches, reports that "as long as the existing situation holds, for the United States to abandon its atomic weapons, or to give the impression that they would not be used, would leave the non-Communist world with a totally inadequate defence." This in spite of the fact that military opinion considers the atomic weapon a weapon not of defence but of offense.

'If atomic weapons *or other weapons of parallel destructiveness* (our emphasis) are used against us or our friends in Europe or Asia, we believe that it could be justifiable for our Government to use them in retaliation *with all possible restraint* (our emphasis)."

Aside from the naive cruelty of the final phrase it should be noted that this pronouncement gives China the moral green light to drop A-bombs on San Francisco. For certainly we have used weapons of parallel destructiveness on their friends, the Koreans.

PRIESTS PLEAD FOR PEACE

The following statements quoted in part from "Religion and the People" (London) bear the badge of sincerity in the flame of their indignation and love:

We see a handful of the mighty of this world possessed by a satanic lust for greed and who through blood, conflagration and misfortune of the nations of the whole globe, are striving to satisfy their selfish pride, lust for riches and power. They are preparing stocks of arms so that, through the mass annihilation of innocent men, children, women, and old people, they may achieve their criminal aims. What else is the mass bombardment of peaceful cities and villages in Korea by airplanes and warships, if not a terrible violation of the Lord's commandments, if not a crime against humanity?

"What else is the mad armaments race and the striving of leading American politicians to rebuild the army of Hitlerite murderers, an army tried in the crime of genocide—if not the retracing of the road to ominous fascism?

Can it be that the crematoria of concentration camps are to smoke once more over Europe and that the heavy toil of nations is to be turned to ashes, ruins and cemeteries? Can we allow that

which is being done before our eves under the flag of the United Nations in ill-fated Korea, which is drowned in blood, to become the lot of other nations which love peace and freedom?

"No! Enough of wars! Enough of devastation and of Man's annihilation! It is to you, brother Catholic priests of the world, that we address ourselves. Let us pray that the Almighty God will enlighten those who err and that He will avert the threat hanging over the head of the nations. Let us unite, with all the greater faith and assurance, with people of good-will who direct their efforts, work and thinking towards the salvation of peace, for they are doing a godly deed.

Let all the Catholics of the world demand together with us the prohibition of atomic weapons, the prohibition of the armaments race, the prohibition of aggression and brutal violence with regard to free nations. Let words of truth and love inspire the nations in the fight against the authors of misery and crimes who are preparing a new conflagration!

"Bring to human souls words of truth about peace! Dissipe Domine gentes quae bellum volunt! We pray to Thee, O Lord, for peace for the nations!"

73 Roman Catholic priests, delegates to the first Peace Congress.

"Our indignation at the Americans' hostilities against the Korean people is increased by the realization that these actions are being committed on the orders of a representative of the American Baptist Church, President Truman. Hecatombs of human lives, destroyed by American arms, will be on the conscience of this pseudo-Christian.

'Thousands of American bombs are being dropped on towns and communities where defenceless old folk, women and children remained. How many towns and villages have been wiped off the Korean earth! And outraged humanity puts the legitimate question to the United States Government: What sense is there in this bombing, which is unprecedented in its brutality? With what just indignation the Korean people now look on the Americans who at one time sent to Korea their missionaries to preach the Gospel, the Gospel of love and peace, and now act in so barbarous a way . . .

"The Security Council must demand the cessation of such inhuman actions by the American interventionists, reminiscent of the actions of the mediaeval Huns who left in their wake deserts of burned towns and settlements.

The All Union Council of Evangelical Christian Baptists of the USSR.

UN RELEASES RHEE DOCUMENTS

We have heard a great deal of South Korea's accusations against the north but little evidence against Rhee's claims. New light on this has recently come from documents found in Rhee's secret files when he fled from Seoul in June. They were sent to the UN secretariat and were made available by them to the press in October. These documents include State Dept. Intelligence bulletins, films, conversations and letters between U. S. and South Korean officials. Photostat copies were sent by the North Koreans to the UN.

Here is news of great interest, but the press has ignored it. These documents have appeared in the Chinese press and also in the National Guardian, New York, Oct. 11, from which we quote some excerpts and condensations:

LETTERS OF SOUTH KOREAN OFFICIALS

Rhee to Cho Bion Ok, his personal representative in U. S., April 1, 1949: "We are ready but we are short of ammunition and must have sufficient armed forces to advance to the North."

Rhee to Dr. R. Oliver, an adviser in U. S. who has admitted authenticity of letter dated Sept. 30, 1949: "I am firmly convinced that now is the psychological moment to take aggressive action... You must convince American statesmen and public opinion, so that they may tacitly consent to our starting operations and give us the necessary military support."

Cho Bion Ok to Rhee, Oct 12, 1949: "The time is not yet ripe" for "the liquidation of the puppet regime of North Korea" but we (Oliver and Rhee's ambassador) have come to the unanimous conclusion that this should be the fundamental plan of our Government, to be put into effect when we are ready and the right moment has come."

Cho to Rhee, Nov. 3, 1949: "Any policy of compromise or conferences is out of the question. The cold war cannot continue indefinitely. All these world problems are insoluble without a third world war." The plan to invade North Korea "must be adapted to the international situation as a whole."

PART PLAYED BY U. S. OFFICIALS

Rhee to Ambassador Chang, April 6, 1949: "General Wedemeyer made a personal, confidential recommendation that we send well-trained, reliable and competent young people into North Korea

to sow distrust and prepare the way for the Republic." (Detailed espionage and sabotage plans were found in the archives.)

U.S. Ambassador Muccio told 3 Rhee cabinet ministers in presence of Gen. Roberts, chief of the U. S. Military Mission, in July 1949: "In July and August large scale preparations are to be made for the campaign against the North" and they must carry out "mass arrests of anti-government elements and members of the South Korean Labor party." (Press reports show such arrests were subsequently made.)

Gen. Roberts told South Korean divisional commanders, Aug. 2 1949: "The U. S. Mission is fully convinced that all the attacks on South Korea are reprisals, and that almost every incident on the Parallel has been provoked by South Korean security forces." On Oct. 2 he told the commanders: "Attacks on territory north of the 38th Parallel have been and will continue to be carried out on my orders. Many military units launch arbitrary attacks against the North, squander masses of shells and obtain no results in spite of heavy losses." So, further attacks on the North "may be carried out only on the orders of the U. S. Military Mission."

DOCUMENTS SHOW SOUTH PLANNED AGGRESSION

The *National Guardian* reports that North Korea complained unavailingly of these attacks to the UN for a year and a half. Gen. Roberts admitted to a N. Y. *Herald Tribune* correspondent on June 5, 1950, that U. S. officers were taking part in such battles. The documents indicate that the U. S. promised Rhee full military support for his attack on the North and quote MacArthur's adviser, Wm. Sebald, in Seoul, Jan. 1950, as promising Rhee that the U. S. fleet and air force based in Japan would aid his invasion.

Mun Hak Won, one of Rhee's advisers, said that Rhee received from MacArthur in Feb. 1950 concrete instructions for the invasion and notice that MacArthur would assume control of military operations when they began. A strategical map of the planned attack was made. J. F. Dulles is shown studying this map in a film made while he was in Seoul and found in Rhee's secret archives.

—The Canadian Far Eastern Newsletter
James G. Endicott, Editor
134 Glenholme Ave., Toronto 10, Can.

MAGNIFICAT PUBLICATIONS

Democracy Within The Church
By G. Cope
Christians and Foreign Affairs
By S. Evans
Christians and The Kingdom of God
By G. Cope
Christians and Communists
By S. Evans
Quick or Dead—
An Open Letter to the Lambeth Bishops
By G. Cope

Published by the Society of Socialist Clergy. These are the pamphlets recently attacked by Lord Vansittart in the British House of Lords. All at 50¢ or 10¢ per copy from S.S.C.M., 37, West Side, Clapham Common, London S.W. 4, England.

* * * * * * * * * * *

THE NEW CHRISTIAN

A new Christian is being born in the world today. He speaks to you in this issue in the voices of Eastern Protestantism and of the peace-loving Roman Catholics of Poland.

The Protestant needs your help to carry these voices to a world trembling on the brink of destruction.

We are grateful for those who are making it possible for us to continue. The burden is heavy for the few who shoulder it.

PRAY FOR PEACE

"Gracious Lord and God of our world!

We cry unto Thee out of our deep needs. Look upon man for whom Thou gavest Thy Son. We are threatened by war; evil hands are stretching forth to take away the fruits of our labour and to destroy the future of our children.

The enemies of mankind are bent on acquiring riches from the poverty, despair, anxieties, suffering and death of others.

The evil spirit of selfishness, cruelty and rapacity pervades men and countries. If Thou, by Thy Grace, dost not please to raise up millions of men of good will, we all will be surely lost.

Be Thou the defender of our life, our work and our children.

Teach us to love everybody, to do and wish good to everybody, to hold sacred the life of everybody, to respect the rights of everybody, to serve the happiness of everybody.

Give victory to those who defend the peace, the creative work and the welfare of all.

Stop the mouths of liars who change truth into falsehood and present war and the demons of war as our benefactors.

Help those who want peace; make their voice strong, their faith courageous and their will unbending.

Reveal Thy truth in this world of disobedience and confusion.

Increase the number of those who are truly obedient to Thee, and make them stand firm in their faith.

Take away the thoughtlessness of Thy children who wish to keep aloof from the struggles of this world. Send them into the heat of the battle and bless for them the weapons of the Spirit so that they may bring victory to what Thou hast ordained for the world: Peace. Amen."

Closing Prayer of Protestant Days

Bishop Laszlo Dezsery

"We are deeply distressed by the bombing of towns and villages of Korea and the destruction of Korea's peaceful population of helpless old folk, women and children by the Air Force and Navy of the United States. At the same time we are greatly surprised and outraged by the fact that Christian America, instead of placing its technique at the service of the well-being and prosperity of mankind, has turned it into an instrument of death and mass destruction and ruin for the people. From the depths of our souls we protest against this humanity-hating anti-Christian act.

The Supreme Patriarch (Catholicos) of all Armenians, Georg VI, and the Supreme Ecclesiastical Council of Holy Echmiadzin.